

### ***ELECTION***

Applicant has amended independent Claims 1 and 22 further clarifying that the order step of Claim 1 is to be performed at the food court by a customer at the food court and that the order means of Claim 22 is to provide for the self-service selection of menu items at the food court by a customer at the food court. Applicant asserts that this obviates the requirement for restriction. However, in the event that the examiner disagrees, Applicant makes a provisional election of the invention of Claims 1-39.

### ***REMARKS***

Applicant is appreciative of the opportunity afforded by Examiner Cuff for Applicant's attorney to discuss this application and the requirement for restriction with the Examiner. Applicant believes that the foregoing amendments are consistent with the discussions between Applicant's attorney and the Examiner, and that they are adoptive of the suggestion made by the Examiner in the office action.

As indicated above, Applicant respectfully suggests that the amendments to independent Claims 1 and 22 have obviated the requirement for restriction. Applicant therefore requests that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn and the consideration of Claims 1-42 proceed on the merits.

Dated this 12 day of August, 2005.

  
J. David Nelson, 31,046

Attorney for Applicant

NELSON, SNUFFER, DAHLE & POULSEN, P.C.

10885 South State

Sandy, UT 84070

(801) 576-1400